



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	East Bay Municipal Utility District	County	Alameda
Project Title	Water Quality Assessment	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 250,000.00

Project Description: The project monitors and tracks changes in water quality, evaluate salt and nutrient concentrations within the groundwater basin, and collect samples to be analyzed at EBMUD's in-house laboratory.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	2
Work Plan	4
Budget	2
Schedule	3
QA/QC	1
Past Performance	1
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	16

- **GWMP or Program:** The applicant has not yet adopted a GWMP for the Basin; however, one is currently being prepared. A Resolution of Intent was signed May 24, 2011 and EBMUD plans to adopt a final GWMP by late 2012.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. Five projects were listed under this application and each project had the same lack in detail and completeness. For example, the project description for Project 1 (install a monitoring well) is missing how the project meets the goals and objectives of the GWMP. There is a general description of the usefulness of this project; however, the description is lacking detail on the quality of data this project would obtain. In fact, there is no description of data, technical methods, and of any analyses to be done on this project. For collaboration with other local agencies a general description was given stating, "The Stakeholder group formed...will be informed of the plans for drilling a well..." without any discussion of how they would be informed and if there was a process in place to inform stakeholders or the public. Lastly, an explanation of how the ongoing use of the project including funding after grant funding is expended was, again very general. A general statement that EBMUD staff and "other" SEBP Basin GMP Stakeholders will maintain and operate the well instrumentation was provided. Also, no description related to how or where the funding for the continued monitoring would be coming from. For some of the other projects that would be sampling from various wells, there was no detail related to how data would be collected, what kind of automated equipment would be installed, and what kind of analyses would be done. Overall, for all five project, very generalized statements as to the work to be done but no details and no assurances provided that the work could be done efficiently and effectively.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The Work Plan overall lacks detail. For example, Project 2 (install water level monitoring instruments in five existing wells) which laid out four tasks stated they were “likely” to hire a consultant to provide assistance through this effort. However, the applicant did not describe in the work plan where the consultants expertise or in what capacity they would be used. Task 1 notes that the City of Hayward will work with EBMUD to gain information on monitoring systems currently in place and “envision” that a compatible system would be installed to monitor the existing five wells. This project seems as if it is in the very beginning stages of its planning process to not know what type of equipment they would need to install at this point. It is difficult to evaluate this project as a whole when the project is lacking readiness and the applicant is unsure of the procedures they will use to complete this project. Overall, for all of the projects there is no sound strategy for evaluating progress and performance at each step of the projects (lacking detail and completeness) and there are no assurances provided that the City of Hayward or EBMUD would be able to obtain access to private property, if needed. There was no description about how information (data gathered from monitoring wells) would be disseminated to the stakeholders or public. Again, the lack of readiness for some of the projects affects the knowledge of, for example, easements and permits and CEQA needs. Project 1 – because the applicant does not know where the site of the monitoring well will be installed they cannot predict whether they would need to obtain an easement and also the applicant is unsure of the environmental impacts, therefore unsure of their CEQA needs.
- **Budget:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. For example, there was no explanatory text provided for the cost basis for each of the budgets was developed. Rates were provided for a consultant; however if no consultant has yet been chosen, where is the basis for the rates provided. Another example, the cost categories were divided into 3 categories: EBMUD staff, Consultant, and Other Costs. Under EBMUD staff costs was a column for Program Administration (admin); however, it also included “Consultant and Other” costs. It is not clear whether this admin cost covers consultant and other admin costs or not. Under the Other Costs category a section for Other Direct Costs is given and lump sums provided for each project, yet with no description and large lump sums, it is unclear as to what is being paid for in this section. Other lump sums are provided with no explanation, as well. Projects 3 and 4 have the same total project costs, yet one project is sampling one well and the other is sampling 3 wells? The reviewer is unsure how the cost basis for those two projects was developed. Project 2 has a total project cost of approximately \$56,000 to install monitoring equipment on five existing wells. The noted cost of installing five, potentially, data loggers seems a bit on the high side. Also, in the work plan it is noted a consultant would likely be hired to provide assistance but no mention of how and when. The budget shows they are providing assistance throughout on each task even when in the work plan on certain tasks it is noted that EBMUD staff would be doing the work.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The schedule is much more detailed than either the work plan or budget and does not follow either by tasks. It is not totally apparent which tasks coincide with those in the work plan and much of the work described in the schedule is not covered in the work plan. For example, in the schedule under Program Administration (which is not covered in the work plan) they include education and outreach which was never discussed in the work plan. The schedule does however start on time but ends a few months past the two year deadline.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. For example, absolutely no information is provided as to procedural assurances, such as review processes for quality of reports, data, or lab analyses. It is stated generally what would be included in each deliverable report but nothing related to quality assurance. No QA/QC Plan was provided for field sampling. No personnel qualifications are provided for EBMUD staff or City of Hayward staff.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. For example, the applicant provided “A Project Manager’s Guide to Applying for and Managing Grants” Manual; however, unrelated to Past Performance. Many of the description’s of the projects were missing making it difficult to tell whether it could be a similar project to those proposed in this application. No copies of supporting documentation were provided of past performance with DWR or any other agency. Also, no documentation provided to indicate if they had finished grants in the allotted time given or within budget.